



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,395	01/20/2000	Aravind Sitaraman	062891.0328	4404

7590 10/22/2003

Baker & Botts, L.L. P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/488,395

Applicant(s)

SITARAMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Dustin Nguyen

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7A.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 55 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-23, 25-40, 42-45, 47-55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. [US Patent No 6,415,313], in view of Chiu et al. [US Patent No 6,597,689].

5. As per claim 1, Yamada discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a system for determining subscriber information, comprising:

an access server coupled to a plurality of subscribers using a communication network [60, Figure 1];

a memory coupled to the access server [152, 161, 171, Figure 2] and operable to store subscriber information for the plurality of subscribers [col 14, lines 22-26] and further operable to store path information that identifies a virtual circuit assigned to each of the plurality of subscriber [Figure 8]; and

a processor coupled to the memory [160, Figure 2] and operable to

compare the path information and the particular virtual circuit used to receive the communication from the particular subscriber [col 13, lines 19-43].

Yamada does not specifically disclose

operable to receive a communication from a particular subscriber using a particular one of a plurality of virtual circuits associated with the communication network;

wherein subscriber information for the particular subscriber is indexed by path information for the particular subscriber; and

determine subscriber information for communication to the particular subscriber based on the comparison.

Chiu discloses

operable to receive a communication from a particular subscriber using a particular one of a plurality of virtual circuits associated with the communication network [col 80, lines 23-37];

wherein subscriber information for the particular subscriber is indexed by path information for the particular subscriber [col 81, lines 57-col 82, lines 8]; and

determine subscriber information for communication to the particular subscriber based on the comparison [col 82, lines 19-56].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamada and Chiu because Chiu's teaching would allow information to safely communicate from end to end.

6. As per claim 2, Yamada discloses

the access server comprises one of a plurality of access servers coupled to the processor [Figure 12]; and

the path information further identifies an access server assigned to the particular subscriber [col 28, lines 19-col 29, lines 10],

the processor is further operable to determine the subscriber information for communication to the particular subscriber based upon the path information and an identifier of the particular access server coupled to the particular subscriber [col 3, lines 7-23].

7. As per claim 3, Yamada discloses the access server comprises an interface coupled to the particular subscriber using the particular virtual circuit [30a-n, 40a-n, Figure 1]; and a controller coupled to the interface and operable to communicate a request identifying the particular virtual circuit that couples the interface and the particular subscriber [110, 120, Figure 2].

8. As per claim 4, Yamada does not disclose the interface comprises a plurality of network line cards; the path information further identifies a network line card assigned to the particular subscriber; and the processor is further operable to determine the subscriber information for communication to the particular subscriber based upon the path information and an identifier of a particular network line card coupled to the particular subscriber. Chiu discloses the interface comprises a plurality of network line cards [Figure 3]; the path information further identifies a network line card assigned to the particular subscriber [col 37, lines 40-45]; and the processor is

Art Unit: 2154

further operable to determine the subscriber information for communication to the particular subscriber based upon the path information and an identifier of a particular network line card coupled to the particular subscriber [col 7, lines 57-67]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamada and Chiu because Chiu's teaching of line card would allow Yamada's system to extend its capability to provide service to a larger group of users.

9. As per claim 5, Yamada discloses the request comprises:

interface information identifying the interface coupled to the particular subscriber [col 10, lines 28-37];

virtual circuit information identifying the particular virtual circuit [col 16, lines 25-32].

access server information identifying the access server [col 28, lines 25-28];

10. As per claim 7, Yamada discloses the request comprises a trivial file transfer protocol request [col 18, lines 60-67].

11. As per claim 8, Yamada discloses the particular virtual circuit is associated with the particular subscriber using a virtual channel identifier and a virtual path identifier [col 16, lines 4-13].

12. As per claim 9, Yamada does not disclose a virtual path identifier and a virtual channel identifier associated with the virtual circuit assigned to the particular subscriber. Chiu discloses

Art Unit: 2154

a virtual path identifier and a virtual channel identifier associated with the virtual circuit assigned to the particular subscriber [Figures 30 and 31]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamada and Chiu because Chiu's teaching would allow information to be carried over different network protocols.

13. As per claim 10, Yamada does not specifically disclose the subscriber information comprises information used to configure a communication device associated with the particular subscriber. Chiu discloses the subscriber information comprises information used to configure a communication device associated with the particular subscriber [col 9, lines 3-30]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamada and Chiu because Chiu's teaching would provide an easy maintenance method for administrator to monitor communication devices.

14. As per claim 11, Yamada discloses the subscriber information comprises at least one Internet protocol address for communication to the particular subscriber [Figure 8].

15. As per claims 12-19, they are method claimed of claims 1-4, and 8-11, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-4, and 8-11.

16. As per claims 20-23, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-5.

17. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.

18. As per claims 26-29, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above in claims 8-11.
19. As per claims 30-37, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-4 and 8-11.
20. As per claims 38, 39 and 40, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 4 and 5.
21. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above in claim 7.
22. As per claims 43, 44 and 45, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 4 and 5.
23. As per claim 47, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
24. As per claims 48-55, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-4 and 8-11.

Art Unit: 2154

25. Claims 6, 24, 41, 46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. [US Patent No 6,415,313], in view of Chiu et al. [US Patent No 6,597,689], and further in view of Benash et al. [US Patent No 6084892].

26. As per claim 6, Yamada and Chiu do not disclose the request comprises a RADIUS protocol request. Benash discloses the request comprises a RADIUS protocol request [col 10, line 19-22]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yamada, Chiu and Benash because Benash's teaching of RADIUS protocol would add another level of security protection to keep the data integrity and to increase the value of the system.

27. As per claims 24, 41, and 46, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 6.

28. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

29. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Art Unit: 2154

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (8:00 – 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directly to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dustin Nguyen


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER